III. REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Sasmazel et al., US 6,725,376 ("Sazmazel"). Claims 5 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sazmazel in view of Muratov et al., US Publication No. 2003/0097596. Applicant has herein amended claims 1, 7, and 11. No new matter is believed added.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16 are allowable over Sazmazel because Sazmazel fails to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For instance, claim 1 (as well as claims 7 and 11) recites, *inter alia*, "a logical security system for processing login and password data received from a client device during a server session *with the Internet server* in order to authenticate a user; and a physical security system for processing Internet protocol (IP) address information of the client device *at the Internet server*."

In other words, Applicant discloses a system that provides complete authentication using a single Internet server – i.e., the Internet server that is responsible for processing login and password data from the client is also responsible for collecting and comparing IP address information from the client. Conversely, Sasmazel discloses a two server system in which a first server (authentication server 350) is utilized to collect authentication information to create an e-ticket, and the second server (authentication server 360) uses the e-ticket to authenticate the user for a server session. Sasmazel teaches that the password and login information is **only** supplied

to the first server 350 (i.e., not the server with which the client seeks to have a session with). See Figure 6 and related text, column 8, lines 21-30. "[A]uthentication server 350 validates the user authentication information and generates an eticket 310." Column 8, lines 63-65. The eticket is then used by the second authentication server 360 to authenticate the user. However, Sasmazel's eticket **does not** include password and login information. Rather, it includes only, e.g., the ticket issuer, IP address, Expiration data, and authorization level (see, e.g., Figure 4 and related text at column 7, lines 27-60). Accordingly, Sasmazel fails to teach a logical security system for processing *login and password data* received from a client device during a server session *with the Internet server* in order to authenticate a user.

As noted, the second server 360 of Sasmazel does not check for login and password data. Instead Sasmazel teaches authenticating a user at second server 360 by "validating" the eticket by merely checking if the "hashing technique and public key operate to properly decrypt and rehash the eticket 310." (See column 9, lines 17-20.) In other words, Sasmazel authenticates a client by checking to see whether the eticket properly decrypts, not by comparing information in the eticket with information stored by the server (e.g., as recited in claims 3, 7 and 11). As such, Sasmazel also fails to teach "determining at the Internet server if the IP address from the received message matches the reference IP address associated with the login data of the requesting user" (claim 7) since, *inter alia*, Sasmazel does not teach or require any type of comparing or matching operation. Instead, Sasmazel's authentication is done merely by seeing if the eticket properly decrypts.

Accordingly, for these reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16 are allowable over Sazmazel. Claims 5 and 15 are believed allowable for similar reasons. Each of

the claims not specifically addressed herein is believed allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as their own unique features.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Mich Hoffm /

Michael F. Hoffman
Reg. No. 40,019

Dated: 8/9/07

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile